

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 1 and 5 remain for examination.

Claim Objection:

Claim 1 is objected to for the reasons set forth in paragraph 3 of the outstanding office action. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the objection.

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 for the reasons stated in paragraph 4-5. Claim 1 has been amended to remove the ground of rejection.

Prior Art Rejection:

Claims 1 and 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as unpatentable over Kamada (6,108,683).

The examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to Claim 1, the examiner points to element 18 of Figure 6 which identifies a "process management table" as being the same as applicant's recited "administrative table." The examiner points to col. 12, line 1-4 and further to col. 19, lines 29-44 and 57-61 and col. 13, lines 42-67 through col. 14, lines 1-20. However, applicant's specifically recited administrator which includes the administrator table stores "administrative table data information respectively unique to said plural independent process schedulers, said data information representative of starting addresses of programs for implementing said plural independent process schedulers, respectively." As emphasized by the underlining, the administrative table stores programs for implementing the schedulers as shown, for example, in applicant's Figure 4. The right hand column of applicant's Figure 4 shows the "Starting Address of Process Scheduler Program" as opposed to the teaching of Kamada which appears to teach the process management table 18, illustrated by the further detailed drawing of Fig. 7,

in which the user processes themselves are stored (perhaps the starting address of the user processes). Kamada Table 7 further shows that the operation time is used as a criteria for selecting which user process to enable.

Thus, Kamada fails to teach one of the specifically recited limitations of applicants claim 1, namely, the use of the administrative table which stores data information respectively unique to said plural independent process schedulers, said data information representative of starting addresses of programs for implementing said plural independent process schedulers, respectively. Further Kamada fails to disclose the index as recited in applicant's claim 1. Specifically Kamada fails to disclose the selector which sequentially increments an index of said administrative table associated with said starting addresses to select said one of said plural independent process schedulers and one of said executable user process.

Conclusion:

It is thus submitted that the Kamada reference must be withdrawn as a Section 102 rejection. In order for a reference to be applied as an anticipatory reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must disclose each and every limitation of the claim. This is certainly not the case here and thus, the Section 102 rejection cannot stand.

It is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date February 8, 2005

By *David A. Blumenthal* 26,409

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

For David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257